

Eka-sattA-vAda vis-a-vis sattA-traividhya-vAda

Background

MithyAtva is defined as प्रतिपन्नोपाधौ त्रैकालिकनिषेधप्रतियोगित्वम्. The word traikAlika-nishedha means atyanta-abhAva. Pratipanna refers to swa-prakAraka-dhI-visheshya and upAdhi refers to adhikaraNa. The term mithyAtva, thus, basically means - स्वप्रकारक-धी-विशेष्यः यः उपाधिः अधिकरणं तन्निष्ठो यः त्रैकालिकनिषेधः अत्यन्ताभावः तस्य प्रतियोगित्वम् - the pratiyogitA of atyanta-abhAva in that very locus where the pratiyogI is being experienced. The locus is the noun in a knowledge, in which the impugned mithyA entity is the adjective.

Thus, if x is appearing in a locus y, then mithyAtva of x refers to the atyanta-abhAva of x in y. Thus, there is traikAlika-nishedha of x in y, even if x is appearing in y.

The example for this mithyAtva is that of shukti-rUpya. Even though silver appears in shukti, there is atyanta-abhAva of silver in shukti. Silver is traikAlika-nishedha-pratiyogI. There was not, is not and will not be any silver in shukti.

Through anumAna, we can prove that all vyAvahArika-vastu are also mithyA. For e.g. अयं पट एतत्तन्तुनिष्ठात्यन्ताभावप्रतियोगी पटत्वात् , पटान्तरवत् or विमतं मिथ्या, दृश्यत्वात् , जडत्वात् , परिच्छिन्नत्वात् , शुक्तिरूप्यवत्. Thus, pot, cloth etc are proved to be mithyA. Therefore, pot, cloth etc are pratiyogI of atyanta-abhAva in the very locus where they are seen.

Objection against mithyAtva

MithyAtva of pot implies its atyanta-abhAva in the locus where it is seen. Now, the locus of pot is pot-avachchhinna-chaitanya (**Advaita Siddhi**, DakshiNAmUrtI Math edition, **volume 3, page 36**). Thus, mithyAtva of pot implies absence of pot in pot-avachchhinna-chaitanya. However, our experience of pot is always in the form of “pot is”. This experience of “pot is” is contradictory to the concluded atyanta-abhAva of pot. Hence, our pratyaksha in the form of “pot is” is contradictory to the anumAna which proves that pot is mithyA. And hence, the anumAna is faulty.

If by using some anumAna, we prove that fire is cold, then that anumAna is contradicted by pratyaksha which shows fire to be hot. Thus, contradicted by pratyaksha, the anumAna is declared to be faulty.

Similarly, the pratyaksha in the form of “pot is” is contradictory to the anumAna which says “pot neither was, nor is nor will be”. Therefore, the anumAna must be deemed to be faulty.

Rebuttal to the objection [Model -1 (Eka-sattA-vAda)]

The existence which is seen in “pot is” does not belong to pot. There would have been a contradiction if the existence and mithyAtva both belonged to pot. However, since existence does not belong to pot, there is no contradiction.

Question: To whom does existence belong then in the pratyaksha “pot is”?

Answer: आरोप्य-तादात्म्य-आपन्न-सद्रूप-अधिष्ठान is the vishaya of pratyaksha “pot is”. And the existence is of this sat-which-is-in-tAdAtmya-with-superimposed-pot. [घटतादात्म्यापन्नं सद् “घटः सन्” इत्यपरोक्षप्रतीतौ भासते। सद्रूपञ्च ब्रह्मैव। ब्रह्मणि सर्वं प्रपञ्चाध्यासात् सर्वत्र सत्प्रतीतेरुपपत्तिः।] (BALABODHINI Page 353). Thus, the vishaya of pratyaksha is not pot, rather pot-tAdAtmya-Apanna-sat is the vishaya.

Further, this Aropya-tAdAtmya is born along with Aropya. So, rajata-tAdAtmya is born along with rajata and pot-tAdAtmya is born along with pot. LaghucudhandrikA/BALABODHINI say in page 353- आरोप्योत्पत्तिकालोत्पन्नतादात्म्यापन्नं सत् सन्घट इति प्रत्यये अपरोक्षतया भाति.

This Aropya-tAdAtmya with sat is also referred as sat-tAdAtmya and is a product of avidyA. LaghuchandrikA says in page 35 - तत्रैव हि सत्तादात्म्याध्यासो यस्य तत्समानकालमध्यासः, शुक्तिरूप्यादिरूपेण परिणममानाविद्याया एव तन्निष्ठेन सत्तादात्म्यरूपेण परिणममानत्वात्. The avidyA which modifies in the form of shukti-rUpya, that very same avidyA transforms as sat-tAdAtmya also.

The issue is further clarified in an absolutely conceptually critical portion of LaghuchandrikA page 45. तस्मादिदमादितादात्म्यस्य रजताद्यवच्छेदेनावश्यमुत्पत्तिः प्रातीतिकभ्रमस्थले वाच्या । तथा च तद्वदेव व्यावहारिकघटादिभ्रमस्थलेऽपि ‘सन्तं घटं जानामि ’ ‘घटं संतं जानामी’त्याकारद्वयानुभवात्, तादृशभ्रमस्य विषयविशिष्टस्य बाधकप्रत्ययेन श्रुत्यनुमानादिना च मिथ्यात्वप्रत्ययाच्च, सदवच्छेदेन घटादिकं तत्तादात्म्यं घटत्वादिसंसर्गश्च, घटाद्यवच्छेदेन सत्तादात्म्यं सत्त्वादिधर्मसंसर्गश्च जायते; केवलस्य सतोऽधिकरणत्वेऽपि तादात्म्यप्रतियोगित्वोपहितरूपेण तस्य तत्सम्बन्धत्वेनावच्छेदकत्वम्। नच-एकस्यैवानादेस्सत्तादात्म्यस्याविद्यायामिव घटादावपि सम्भवात् घटाद्यवच्छेदेनानन्तसत्तादात्म्यानामुत्पत्तौ न मानमिति वाच्यम् । सत्तादात्म्यं हि चिद्रूपज्ञानस्य विषयतारूपतादात्म्यम् । तथा च कपालादिनिष्ठविषयतारूपसत्तादात्म्येनावच्छिन्नस्य घटादिनिष्ठविषयतारूपस्य सत्तादात्म्यस्य तन्त्वादिनिष्ठविषयतारूपसत्तादात्म्यावच्छिन्नेन पटादिनिष्ठविषयतारूपेण सत्तादात्म्येनाभेदासंभवादवच्छेदकभेदेन सत्तादात्म्यानां भेदस्यावश्यकत्वेनानन्त्यं प्रामाणिकम् ।

The above establishes the creation of sat-tAdAtmya, with pot as the avachchhedaka. **Sat-tAdAtmya is defined as the vishayatA-rUpa-tAdAtmya of chit-rUpa-jnAna.** Just as there is creation of idam-tAdAtmya with silver as the avachchhedaka in case of prAtibhAsika-bhrama, there is creation of the following in case of vyAvahArika-bhrama (such as pot-Brahman) on account of two vyavahAra “I know existing pot” and “I know pot as existing”:

1. sat-tAdAtmya with pot as avachchhedaka

2. Sattva-dharma-samsarga with pot as avachchedaka
3. pot-tAdAtmya with sat as avachchedaka
4. Pot-ness-dharma-samsarga with sat as avachchedaka
5. Pot with sat as avachchedaka

While only-sat is the locus, tAdAtmya-pratibhoga-upahita-sat can serve as the avachchedaka through tAdAtmya-sambandhatva.

Further, it should not be argued that creation of infinite sat-tAdAtmya, with pot, cloth etc as avachchedaka, is not proper on account of sat-tAdAtmya being singular and anAdi and it can inhere in pot just as it does so in avidyA. One should not argue thus because sat-tAdAtmya means vishayatA-rUpa-tAdAtmya of chit-rUpa-jnAna. Now, in case of pot, the sat-tAdAtmya-1 i.e. pot-nishTha-vishayatA-of-chit-rUpa-jnAna is delimited by kapAl-nishTha-vishayatA-rUpa-sat-tAdAtmya whereas in case of cloth, the sat-tAdAtmya-2 i.e. cloth-nishTha-vishayatA-of-chit-rUpa-jnAna is delimited by tantu-nishTha-vishayatA-rUpa-sat-tAdAtmya. Now, sat-tAdAtmya-1 and sat-tAdAtmya-2 cannot have abheda. Therefore, the difference in sat-tAdAtmya must be accepted on account of the difference in avachchedaka. And hence, there is prAmANya in accepting that there is Anantya of sat-tAdAtmya.

Question: Fine. There is creation of sat-tAdAtmya by modification of avidyA. However, Aropya-ghaTa-tAdAtmya-Apanna-sat, which you state as the vishaya of pratyaksha, and to which the existence belongs being the sat-rUpa-adhishThAna, is nothing but Brahman. And Brahman is not an object of chAkshusha-pratyaksha. Brahman is the object of only shabda-pramANa. How can it be the object of cognition - “pot is”? [सदर्थस्य ब्रह्मणः रूपादिहीनस्यासंसारमज्ञानावृतस्य शब्दैकगम्यस्य कथं घटः सन्नित्यादिबुद्धिविषयता स्यात् ?] Advaita Siddhi - page 318.

Answer: It is not the shuddha chaitanya, which is the object of pratyaksha “pot is”. Here, the pratyaksha is of sat, which is in tAdAtmya with pot. Thus, there is no contradiction in chAkshusha-pratyaksha of Brahman with the pot as the avachchedaka. [एवंच घटाद्यवच्छेदेन ब्रह्मणः चाक्षुषतावादो युक्त एव. Advaita Siddhi, comment in summary by Ananta Krishna Shastry - page 322].

Further, Brahman is sat-chit-Ananda. Here, sat and chit are not covered by mUJAjnAna. Only Ananda is covered by mUJAjnAna. Sat and chit are covered only by avasthA-ajnAna. So, by chAkshusha-pratyaksha, there is nAsha of avasthA-ajnAna (or tUJAjnAna), and there is pratyaksha of

Aropya-tAdAtmya-Apanna-sat. In case one does not accept avasthA-ajnAna and accepts only mUlaAjnAna in eka-ajnAna-paksha, all three namely sat, chit and Ananda are accepted to be covered by mUlaAjnAna. And in case of chAkshusha-pratyaksha, there is abhibhava (and not nAsha) of mUla-ajnAna-vishayatA with pot etc as the avachchedaka. And hence, there is pratyaksha of Aropya-tAdAtmya-Apanna-sat. In such a case, the AvaraNa of sat by mUla-ajnAna is considered to be subdued with pot as the avachchedaka and hence there is chAkshusha-pratyaksha of ghaTa-tAdAtmya-Apanna-sat. In either case, there is pratyaksha of ghaTa-tAdAtmya-Apanna-sat only and not of Shuddha Brahman.

यतः सदात्मना न ब्रह्मणो मूलाज्ञानेनावृतत्वम् ; किन्तु घटाद्यवच्छिन्नशक्त्यज्ञानेनैव ; तथा च चक्षुरादिजन्यवृत्त्या तदावरण भङ्गे सति 'सन्द्यट' इत्यत्र ब्रह्मणः स्फुरणे बाधकाभावात् । [Advaita Siddhi - page 318]

सद्भानानन्दानां मध्ये आनन्दान्तरूपेणैव ब्रह्म मूलाज्ञानेनावृतम् । 'पूर्णानन्दो मे न भाती'ति प्रत्ययात् सद्भानरूपे भात इति प्रत्ययाच्च । ननु, तर्हि सद्भानांशयोरनावृतत्वात् घटाकारवृत्त्यभावकालेऽपि 'घटः सन् घटो भाती'ति धीः स्यात् । तत्राह किञ्चित्त्वित्यादि । शक्त्यज्ञानेन मूलाज्ञानावस्थारूपाज्ञानेन । नन्वेकाज्ञानपक्षे शक्त्यज्ञानास्वीकारेण मूलाज्ञानेनैव सद्भानांशाभ्यामावृतत्वं ब्रह्मणो वाच्यम् । तत्राह -- तथा चेति । तथा स्वीकारेऽपीत्यर्थः । मूलाज्ञानेनैव सद्भानात्मना ब्रह्मण आवृतत्वस्वीकारपक्षेऽपीति यावत् । अपिशब्दात् पूर्वकल्पसङ्ग्रहः । तदावरणेति । घटाद्यवच्छिन्नावरणेत्यर्थः । भङ्गे अभिभवे । यद्येकमेवाज्ञानं, तदा तद्विषयताया घटाद्याकारवृत्तिकाले घटाद्यवच्छेदेनाभिभवात् घटाद्यवच्छेदेन सद्भानांशयोर्व्यवहारः । तस्याभिभवस्तु, तत्तदाकारवृत्त्यभाववैशिष्ट्यविघटनेन 'सन् घटो भाती'त्यादिव्यवहारे प्रतिबन्धाक्षमत्वम् । तादृशव्यवहारं प्रति हि घटाद्याकारवृत्त्यभावविशिष्टाया एव मूलाज्ञानविषयतायाः प्रतिबन्धकत्वम् । यदि तु मूलाज्ञानस्यावस्थारूपाणि घटाद्यवच्छिन्नानि अनन्तान्यज्ञानानि स्वीक्रियन्ते, तदा घटाद्याकारवृत्त्या तदुच्छेदेन तथा व्यवहार इति भावः । [Laghuchandrika - page 318]

Question: This means that some aspects of Brahman are seen in samsAra-dashA while some are manifest only in mukti?

Answer: Precisely. Those aspects of Brahman, the locus, which are seen in bhrama as well as bAdha are called sAmAnyA. Those aspects, which are seen only in bAdha, are called vishesha. Now, the sat-chit-Ananda with avachchedaka such as pot, cloth are called sakhanDa-sat-chit-Ananda and are sAmAnyA. Sat-chit-Ananda without any avachchedaka is called akhanDa-sat-chit-Ananda and is called vishesha. While sAmAnyA can be seen during persistence of world-Brahman-illusion in the form of "pot is, pot shines, pot is dear - घटः अस्ति, घटः भाति, घटः प्रियः", akhanDa-paripUrNa-Ananda-Brahman shines only in mukti. One should not argue that sakhanDa-sat-chit-Ananda is not sAmAnyA on account of their absence in Brahman. One should not argue thus on account of existence of "ब्रह्म अस्ति, ब्रह्म भाति, ब्रह्म प्रियमिति". Real sakhanDa-sat-chit-Ananda are, in any case, never there.

Thus, due to the avachchedakAs such as pot, cloth etc, there is vyapadesha of sakhanDa-sat-chit-Ananda such as pot-avachchhinna-sat-chit-Ananda. And they are covered by asattva-ApAdaka-ajnAna, abhAna-ApAdaka-ajnAna and anAnanda-ApAdaka-ajnAna. When there is AvaraNa-nAsha, there is a manifestation of sakhanDa-sat-chit-Ananda. In case of Ananda, since it is also mUJAjnAna-covered, there is manifestation of Ananda-pratibimba only and not Ananda as such, unlike in case of sat and chit. [Advaita Parishuddhi - page 353]

LaghuchandrikA explains the concept as under: यथा हि एकस्या एव चितः कल्पितभेदेनांशत्रयं सत्ता स्फुरणं आनन्दश्च । तदुक्तं वृद्धैः- 'अस्ति भाति प्रियं रूपं नाम चेत्यंशपञ्चकम् । आद्यं त्रयं ब्रह्मरूपं जगद्रूपं ततो द्वयम् ॥' इति । तत्र सत्तांशस्य व्यवहारे असत्त्वापादकाज्ञानं प्रतिबन्धकम् । स्फुरणांशस्याभानापादकमज्ञानम् । आनन्दांशस्यानानन्दापादकाज्ञानम् । सत्तांश एव ज्ञानांशः । तस्य त्रितयस्याखण्डस्यैव अस्तिस्फुरत्यानन्दतिवाच्यत्वेन घटोऽस्तीत्यादौ शुद्धचित्प्रकारको बोधः । [LaghuchandrikA - page 310]

Shat-BhUshanI explains the same as under:

तत्राज्ञानं त्रिविधम्—असत्त्वापादकम्—अस्तित्वप्रत्ययविरोधि ।
 अभानापादकमज्ञानमपरम्—भातिप्रत्ययविरोधि । तृतीयमनानन्दापादकम-
 ज्ञानम्—आनन्दप्रत्ययविरोधि । विषया हि अज्ञानब्रह्मोभयोपादेयाः—
 अस्ति भाति प्रियं रूपं नाम चेत्यंशपञ्चकम् ।
 आद्यं त्रयं ब्रह्मरूपं जगद्रूपं ततो द्वयम् ॥
 इति वचनात् स्वोपादानाज्ञानरूपाभ्यां नामरूपवन्तः, स्वोपादानब्रह्मरूपैः
 सत्ताभानानन्दरूपवन्तः ।
 तत्रास्तीतिप्रत्ययविरोधि, नास्तीतिप्रत्ययप्रयोजकं वाऽज्ञानमसत्त्वापादकं
 परोक्षज्ञानेन निवर्तते । तत्र तत्तद्विषयगतासत्त्वापादकाज्ञानस्य क्षणभेदेन
 तत्तद्विषयकत्वानि नैकविधानि, इति एकेन परोक्षज्ञानेन तत्तत्पुरुषगतेन
 तत्तद्घटादिविषयत्वानि तत्तत्कालगतान्येकैकान्येव निवर्तन्ते, न तु सर्वाणि
 विषयत्वानि । तथा सकृत्परोक्षतया ज्ञाते घटादौ पुनरपि तत्राज्ञानम्, तथा
 ज्ञानं चोपपद्यते, इति न विदिताविदिताविभागः, न वा एकेन ज्ञाते अन्यस्यापि
 ज्ञानापत्तिः ; क्षणभेदेन तत्तद्विषयगतविषयत्वानामिव पुरुषभेदेनाज्ञान-
 नानात्वस्य स्वीकारात् ।

Question: Be that as it may. It still implies that Brahman is an object of chAkshusha-pratyaksha. However, Brahman is devoid of rUpa. How can it be an object of chAkshusha-pratyaksha?

Answer: This rule is applicable only for something which is prati-niyata-indriya-grAhya. Brahman, on the other hand, is sarva-indriya-grAhya. That means, if something can be known only by chakshu-indriya, then there is a requirement of it having rUpa. Or if something can be known only by shrotra-indriya, then there is a requirement of it having shabda. However, Brahman is sarva-indriya-grAhya. Hence, there is no requirement of it having rUpa, shabda etc for having pratyaksha. So, there is no contradiction that despite not having rUpa, one can have pratyaksha of Brahman (Aropya-tAdAtmya-Apanna-sat). [Further, rUpa does not have rUpa and yet there is

chAkshusha-pratyaksha of rUpa. If it is said that nIrUpa-dravya should have rUpa for chAkshusha-pratyaksha, then Brahman is not accepted as a dravya to fall within the ambit of this rule. Further, even if Brahman is accepted as dravya, just as kAla, it does not require rUpa for chAkshusha-pratyaksha.]

Further, Brahman is not merely sarva-indriya-grAhya but also sarva-pratyaya-vedya. What is known is not an inert object. Prameya is not an inert object but object-avachchhinna-chaitanya. So, it is Brahman alone, with the delimitation of object, which is the vishaya of all pramANAs. VArtikakAra says - अतोऽनुभव एवैको विषयोऽज्ञातलक्षणः । अक्षादीनां स्वतःसिद्धो यत्र तेषां प्रमाणता ॥ This needs to be understood carefully. Its anvaya is as follows-: अतः अज्ञातलक्षणः स्वतःसिद्ध अनुभव एव अक्षादीनां एकः विषयः यत्र तेषां प्रमाणता. **LaghuchandrikA** explains it in **page 318**. Anubhava refers to sat-rUpa-AtmA which is chaitanya. It is only the chaitanya which is the vishaya of avidyA. It is only the chaitanya which is ajnAta. Anything which is non-chaitanya cannot have ajnAtatva because darkness cannot cover darkness. Non-chaitanya is merely the avachchhedaka of ajnAna-vishayatA. Now, since only chaitanya can have ajnAtatva, it is only the swatah-siddha i.e. non-superimposed chaitanya which can be a vishaya of chakshu-indriya etc i.e. indriya-janya-mano-vritti or dosha-janya-avidyA-vritti. If chaitanya were not to be the vishaya of pramANa, then they would no longer have pramANatA because pramANa operates only in respect of ajnAta-abAdhita-vishaya.

Therefore, it is Brahman (with vishaya as the avachchhedaka) which is the vishaya of any pramANa. Hence, the objection that Brahman cannot be the object of chAkshusha-pratyaksha is not correct.

Conclusion of Model 1

In this model, the superimposed entities have no sattA. The perception of sattA is that of Aropya-utpatti-kAla-utpanna-tAdAtmya-Apanna-sat. Therefore, in this model, the pot or illusory silver have no existence as their very swarUpa. So, the nishedha is through swa-nishTha-dharma such as ghaTatva or rajatatva and not through some vyadhikaraNa-dharma.

Prior to taking up the rebuttal of the original objection in the second model, it will be useful to understand the salient features of eka-sattA-vAda and sattA-traividhya-vAda. The model 1 discussed so far relates to eka-sattA-vAda.

Eka-sattA-vAda

We have seen that eka-sattA-vAda accommodates the sat-rUpatva of only one entity, and that is Brahman. No other entity has sattva. The perception of sattva in them is explained by mithyA sat-tAdAtmya. In eka-sattA-vAda, there is two-fold prakriyA.

In one prakriyA, prAtibhAsika as well as vyAvahArika vastu are mUlAvidyA-kArya and are referred to as possessing vyAvhArikatva. In second prakriyA, despite both being mUlAvidyA-kArya, a distinction of prAtibhAsikatva and vyAvahArikatva is made on account of the former being Agantuka-dosha-janya and latter not being so.

In either case, there is mere vyapadesha of vyAvahArikatva and prAtibhAsikatva. No vyAvahArika-sattA or prAtibhAsika-sattA is accepted. [Shat BhUshanI: Volume 1: Page 63]

निवृत्तिर्विरुद्धयते । एकसत्तावादे तु ब्रह्मण एकस्यैव सद्रूपत्वम् । अन्येषां तु तत्र कल्पितानां रज्जुसर्पादिस्थल इव भिन्नत्वात्, दृष्टान्त इदंतादात्म्यस्यैव ब्रह्मणि सत्तादात्म्यस्यैव स्वीकाराच्च शुक्तिरजतभ्रमकाले रजतार्थिनो घटादितो निवृत्तिरिवाश्चार्थिनः महिषादितो निवृत्तिरबाधिता । न हि घटपटादीनां सन्धटः, सन्धट इत्यादिप्रतीतिविषयाणामप्येकसत्तावादे सद्रूपत्वम्, तेनैक्यं वा मन्यते, किंतु सत्तादात्म्यम्, परस्परं भेदश्च ।
एकसत्तावादे द्विविधा प्रक्रिया—एका—सर्वेषां मूलज्ञानकार्यत्वेन शुक्तिरूप्यादिसाधारण्येन व्यावहारिकत्वमिति, अपरा—मूलज्ञानकार्यत्वेऽप्यागन्तुकदोषजन्यत्वेन शुक्तिरूप्यादीनां प्रातिभासिकत्वम्, मूलविधिरूपानागन्तुकदोषजन्यत्वेन यावद्ब्रह्मसाक्षात्कारमवाधाद् व्यावहारिकत्वव्यपदेशमात्रम्, न तु व्यावहारिकी, प्रातिभासिकी वा सत्ताऽपि स्वीक्रियते ।

In eka-sattA-vAda, san-mAtra-grAhI-pratyaksha is accepted. ghatA-jnAna etc are bhrama. What shines in pot during cognition “pot is”, is basically sat-tAdAtmya and not sattva. Accordingly, there is no contradiction with mithyAtva-anumAna. [Shat BhUshanI: Volume 1: Page 90]

एकसत्तावादे तु सन्मात्रग्राहिप्रत्यक्षं प्रमाणम् । घटादिविकल्पज्ञानं तु भ्रमः । सन्धट इत्यादौ घटादौ सत्तादात्म्यमात्रं भासते, न तु सत्त्वमित्युररीकरणात् प्रपञ्चस्य सत्त्वाभावात् स्वरूपतत्त्वसत्यत्वाभाव एव मिथ्यात्वापरपर्यायोऽनुमानेन साध्यते, इति सन्धट इति प्रत्यक्षस्य न तन्मिथ्यात्वानुमानेन विरोधगन्धोऽपीति तु तत्त्वशुद्धिकारादयः । सति चैवं न कालात्ययापदेशस्य

The same is stated by VedAnta ParibhAshA by PanchAnan BhattAchArya in page 139. Before starting the alternative prakriyA of sattA-traividhya-vAda, he says -

एकसत्त्वमतेन प्रत्यक्षाविरोधमुपपाद्य सत्त्वत्रैविध्यमतेनापि तमुपपादयति—यद्वेति ।

Thus, it is clear that san-mAtra-grAhI-pratyaksha is valid only in eka-sattA-vAda.

Further, in case of eka-sattA-vAda, swarUpa-negation of prAtibhAsika-rajata and vyAvahArika-ghaTa is accepted.

SattA-traividhya-vAda

In case of sattA-traividhya-vAda, however, such singular sattA belonging only to Brahman is not accepted. Instead, pAramArtika, vyAvahArika and prAtibhAsika sattAs are admitted. VedAnta ParibhAshA says - पारमार्थिकं सत्त्वं ब्रह्मणः, व्यावहारिकं सत्त्वमाकाशादेः, प्रातिभासिकं सत्त्वं शुक्तिरजतादेः ।

LaghuchandrikA explains in **page 402** - त्रिविधसत्त्वानां लक्षणानि तूक्तानि । पल्लवाविद्याकार्यगतं चैतन्यं प्रातीतिकं सत्त्वम् । मूलाविद्याकार्यगतं व्यावहारिकम् । शुद्धचिद्रूपं पारमार्थिकमित्यादि तत्त्वदीपनाद्युक्तम् ।

BhAshyakAra says the same in TaittirIya BhAshya: सत्यं च व्यवहारविषयम् , अधिकारात् ; न परमार्थसत्यम् ; एकमेव हि परमार्थसत्यं ब्रह्म । इह पुनः व्यवहारविषयमापेक्षिकं सत्यम् , मृगतृष्णिकाद्यनृतापेक्षया उदकादि सत्यमुच्यते । अनृतं च तद्विपरीतम् ।

Advaita Siddhi by Swami Vishuddhananda Giri, in **page 290** says that kAryAvidyA-avachchhinna-chit is prAtibhAsika-sattA, mUlaAvidyA-avachchhinna-chit is vyAvahArika-sattA whereas shuddha-chit is pAramArthika-sat.

का दृष्टान्त नहीं बनाया जा सकता है। यही यहाँ पर पूर्वपक्ष का आशय है। सिद्धान्ती पूर्वपक्ष का खण्डन करते हुए कह रहे हैं कि अद्वैतसिद्धान्त में प्रातिभासिक, व्यावहारिक और पारमार्थिक, ये तीन सत्ताएँ मानी जाती हैं। इनमें पूर्व-पूर्व की अपेक्षा उत्तरोत्तर सत्ता अधिक उत्कृष्ट मानी जाती है। इनमें से कार्याविद्यावच्छिन्नचित् प्रातिभासिकसत्ता है, जो कि 'सदिदं रजतम्' इत्यादि भ्रम में प्रतीत होती है। मूलाविद्यावच्छिन्नचित् व्यावहारिकसत्ता है, जो कि 'घटः सन्' इत्यादि ज्ञानों में भासित होती है। शुद्धचिद्रूप पारमार्थिकसत्ता है, जो कि 'सदहम्' इत्यादि ज्ञानों में प्रतीत होती है। अतः शुक्तिरूप्यादि प्रातिभासिकपदार्थों की अपेक्षा से अधिकसत्ता व्यावहारिकपदार्थों की है और व्यावहारिकसत्ता की अपेक्षा से अधिकसत्ता पारमार्थिकपदार्थ (ब्रह्म) की है। अतः

VedAnta ParibhAshA commented by PanchAnana BhattAchArya, explains in **page 139** - पारमार्थिकसत्त्वं कालत्रयाबाध्यत्वम्, व्यावहारिकसत्त्वं ब्रह्मप्रमातिरिक्ताबाध्यत्वम्, प्रातिभासिकसत्त्वं ब्रह्मप्रमातिरिक्तबाध्यत्वम्।

Rebuttal to the objection [Model -2 (SattA-traividhya-vAda)]

In sattA-traividhya-vAda, the vishaya of cognition “pot is” is vyAvahArika-sattva which belongs to pot. (तथा च "घटः सन्" इति प्रत्यक्षस्य व्यावहारिकसत्त्वविषयत्वेन प्रामाण्यम्). This vyAvahArika-sattva is not contradictory to mithyAtva as only pAramArthika-sattva, which is traikAlika-abAdhyatva-rUpa, is contradictory to mithyAtva. This will be on account of modification in the definition of mithyAtva proposed through pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka. Therefore, there is no contradiction to original mithyAtva-anumAna by the perception “pot is”. The relevant excerpt from VedAnta ParibhAshA by PanchAnana BhattAchArya is reproduced as under:

भावः । ननु घटाकाशादेर्व्यावहारिकसत्ताङ्गीकारे नेह नानास्ति किञ्चनेति श्रुत्या ब्रह्मणि निषेधो न स्यात् , व्यावहारिकसत्त्वेन घटादेस्तत्र विद्यमानत्वात् , येन रूपेण यद् यत्र विद्यते, तेन रूपेण तत्र तन्निषेधायोगादित्यत आह—अस्मिंश्च पक्ष इति । निषेध इति । नेह नानास्ति किञ्चनेत्यादि-श्रुत्येति शेषः । न स्वरूपेण न व्यावहारिकत्वेन । न विरोध इति । घटः सन्नित्यादि प्रत्यक्षं हि घटादेर्व्यावहारिकसत्त्वमवगमयति, श्रुतिस्तु पारमार्थिकसत्त्वाभावम् । तेन न प्रत्यक्षविरोध इति भावः । न च तन्निषेधश्रुतीनां

In sattA-traividhya-vAda, the negation of superimposed vastu is not by swarUpa, because the sattA thereof has been admitted. Instead, the negation is by vyadhikaraNa-dharma namely pAramArthikatva. VedAnta ParibhAshA says - अस्मिन् पक्षे घटादेर्ब्रह्मणि निषेधो न स्वरूपेण, किन्तु पारमार्थिकत्वेनैवेति न विरोधः । अस्मिन् पक्षे च मिथ्यात्वलक्षणे पारमार्थिकत्वावच्छिन्नप्रतियोगिताकत्वमत्यन्ताभावविशेषणं द्रष्टव्यम् । Therefore, the definition of mithyAtva shall be modified as प्रतिपन्नोपाधौ पारमार्थिकत्वावच्छिन्नप्रतियोगिताकत्रैकालिकनिषेधप्रतियोगित्वम्. Thus, the pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka is not some swarUpa-nishTha-dharma such as ghaTatva or rajatatva but pAramArthikatva.

This negation through pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka dharma being pAramArthikatva is postulated as a matter of tushyatu-durjana-nyAya as is stated categorically in **LaghuchandrikA page 23** (old edition).

ननु, कालसंबन्धित्वमास्तां प्रपञ्चे । विशेष्यभूतमुक्तप्रतियोगित्वं तु न तत्रास्ति । येन हि रूपेण संबन्धेन च यत्र यत् संबध्यते । न च तेन रूपेण तत्संबन्धेन च तत्र तदभावे विरोधादिति - मन्वानं वादिनं प्रति तुष्यतु दुर्जन इति न्यायेन तन्मतमनुसृत्य साध्यान्तरमाह - पारमार्थिकेत्यादि । पारमार्थिकत्वावच्छिन्नं यदुक्तप्रतियोगित्वं तद्वन्न वेत्यर्थः ।

This view is postulated, which is valid within sattA-traividhya-vAda, to cater to those persons who cannot comprehend the negation of x in y in that very form and in that very sambandha by which x appears in y.

Comparison of eka-sattA-vAda vis-a-vis sattA-traividhya-vAda

Head	Eka-sattA-vAda	SattA-traividhya-vAda
1	There is sattA of only one entity namely Brahman. Superimposed entities have no sattA.	There is sattA of Brahman, vyAvahArika vastu and prAtibhAsika vastu. Despite being superimposed entities, they have sattA, although they are progressively lower.
2	In the pratyaksha “ghaTah san”, there is perception of existence belonging to	In the pratyaksha “ghaTah san”, there is perception of vyAvahArika-sattva belonging to pot.

Head	Eka-satta-vAda	SattA-traividhya-vAda
	Aropya-tAdAtmya-Apanna-sat.	
3	The nishedha of mithyA vastu is by swarUpa.	The nishedha of mithyA vastu is by vyadhikaraNa-dharma, pAramArthikatva.
4	san-mAtra-grAhI-pratyaksha is accepted. adhishThAna-jnAna is pramA, vikalpa-jnAna (pot-jnAna) is bhrama.	san-mAtra-grAhI-pratyaksha is not admitted. vikalpa-jnAna (pot-jnAna) is accepted as pramA.
5	Though there is vyapadesha of pratibhAsikatva and vyAvahArikatva, no vyAvahArika or prAtibhAsika sattA is admitted.	VyAvahArika and PrAtibhAsika sattA are admitted.
6	It is the preferred model.	It is by tushyatu-durjana-nyAya.
7	It is for uttama-adhikArI. (Sanskrit VichAra SAgara, page 150: दृष्टिदृष्टिवादैकसत्तावादैकजीववादेषु दृढतरसंस्कारवानुत्तमाधिकारी)	It is for manda-adhikArI.

It may be noted that, however, with appropriate change in the definition of prAtibhAsika and vyAvahArika sattA by bringing it in alignment with sat-tAdAtmya, even sattA-traividhya-vAda can accommodate swarUpa-negation and san-mAtra-grAhI-pratyaksha. In such a case, vyAvahArika-sattva is mere sattvena-vyavahAra-mAtra and not a separate sattva. Advaita Siddhi by DakshiNAMurti Math at page 310 says the following:

में तीनप्रकार की सत्ता नहीं मानी जाती है। इस शङ्का का निराकरण करते हुए सिद्धान्ती कह रहे हैं कि इस प्रकार का दोष देना समीचीन नहीं है, क्योंकि सत्त्वेन प्रतीतिमात्र का नाम है व्यावहारिकसत्त्व। स्वतन्त्ररूप से प्रपञ्च में कोई सत्त्व नहीं है। इस प्रकार अद्वैतसिद्धान्त में जो लोग एक ही सत्त्व मानते हैं और उसी सत्त्व को लेकर व्यावहारिकपदार्थों में भ्रम से सत्त्व का प्रयोग करते हैं। अर्थात् व्यावहारिकपदार्थों में सत्त्व नहीं है। ऐसे मानने वालों को लक्ष्य कर के व्यावहारिकपदार्थों में सत्त्व बतलाने के लिए सत्त्व को साध्य बनाया गया है। अद्वैतसिद्धान्त में जो लोग तीन प्रकार का सत्त्व स्वीकार कर घटपटादि में पारमार्थिकसत्त्व नहीं मानते हैं उनको उद्देश्य कर के परमार्थसत्त्व को साध्य बनाया गया है। इस प्रकार से साध्य बनाने पर परमार्थत्वरूपविशेषण माध्वमत से व्यर्थ होने पर भी अद्वैतवेदान्ती के मत में व्यर्थ नहीं है। क्योंकि परार्थानुमान पर मत को लक्ष्य कर के किया जाता है। इसलिए प्रकृत में परमार्थत्वरूप विशेषण

LaghuchandrikA clarifies the same:

व्यवहारमात्रमिति। एकमेवाधिष्ठानीभूतं ब्रह्मसत्त्वं कल्पिततादात्म्यसम्बन्धेन सदाकारधीमात्रे प्रकारः। न तु व्यावहारिकपारमार्थिकप्रातीतिकसत्त्वानां भेद इति 'सदिद'मिति धीप्रकारस्वरूपैक्यसाधने न सिद्धसाधनम्। त्रिकालाबाध्यत्वोपलक्षितस्वरूपात्यन्ताभेदस्य प्रतिवादिना प्रपञ्चे अनङ्गीकारादिति भावः। अर्थगतं सकलव्यावहारिकविशेष्यकधीप्रकारः पृथक्। 'शुक्तिरूप्यं सत्' 'ब्रह्म सदित्यादिधीविषयाभ्यां प्रातीतिकपारमार्थिकसत्त्वाभ्यामन्यत्। त्रिविधसत्त्वानां लक्षणानि तूक्तानि। पल्लवाविद्याकार्यगतं चैतन्यं प्रातीतिकं सत्त्वम्। मूलाविद्याकार्यगतं व्यावहारिकम्। शुद्धचिद्रूपं पारमार्थिकमित्यादि तत्त्वदीपनाद्युक्तम्।

The following may also be consulted:

1. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iYFM0RArZII&list=PLpQCHvng-MECrfs6SJBLz_r98ns1KoGDg&index=35
2. <https://sudhanshushekhar.wordpress.com/2023/08/04/swarupa-negation-of-illusory-silver/>
3. <https://sudhanshushekhar.wordpress.com/2024/07/06/ajnana-and-its-subduing/>
4. <https://jainqq.org/> (For searching in LaghuchandrikA)